APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,080	08/22/2003	Michael Arnouse	1221-CIP-03	1713

35811	7590	01/11/2006

IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
1650 MARKET ST
SUITE 4900
PHILADELPHIA, PA   19103

EXAMINER
GURSHMAN, GRIGORY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/647,080</td><td>Applicant(s)
ARNOUSE, MICHAEL</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Grigory Gurshman</td><td>Art Unit
2132</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 October 2005_. ·

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,3,6-16,34,35 and 37-55_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,3,6-16,34,35 and 37-55_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's amendment of the independent claims 1 and 34 and addition of the

new claims 44-55 have necessitated the new grounds of rejection.

2.   Applicant' argument are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection provided

herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 34-38 and 43-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Lofgren (US 2001/0037313 A1).

5.   Referring to the instant claims, Lofgren discloses a digital watermarking system

(see abstract and Fig. 1). Lofgren teaches that watermarking is employed to facilitate

secure online transactions. The system includes a user terminal and a central site. The

user terminal includes a watermark reader, and a capture device to capture an image of

a watermarked document. The central site includes a database of image hashes. The

user terminal communicates with the central site. The watermark reader reads a

watermark and computes a hash of a captured image, and passes the hash to the central site for comparison with the database of image hashes (see abstract).

6.   Referring to the independent claim 34, the limitation "storing identifying information on a card" is met by card (12) in Fig. 1. The limitation "reading the stored identifying information from the card, wherein the identifying information comprises biometric information..." is met by reading the watermark from the card by unit 43 (in Fig. 2) and by Lofgren's teaching that the identifying information being biometric information (see lines 0069). The limitation "creating an authentication mark based on the stored identifying information; transmitting information along with authentication mark" is met by units 43 and 42 transmitting the information over the network (see Fig. 2). The limitation "receiving the information along with the authentication mark at first destination, verifying whether the information is authorized based on the authentication mark" is met by teaching that reader reads and extracts embedded data from the document. The embedded data is used to index or otherwise identify corresponding verification data. The corresponding verification data is preferably predetermined and stored for comparison (see lines 0069 and Fig. 2).

7.   Referring to claim 35, Lofgren teaches comparing verification data with stored verification data for authentication (see lines 0069).

8.   Referring to claims 37, 43 and 49 Lofgren teaches identifying information being biometric information (see lines 0069).

9.   Referring to claim 38, Lofgren inherently teaches a reader for reading the

biometric information because the reader (43) reads the stored watermark information

from the card, wherein the watermark comprises biometric information on it (see 0069).

10.   Referring to claim 48, inherently teaches using IP addresses because he teaches

using the network.

11.   Referring to claim 50, Lofgren teaches the use of a PIN code (see lines 0069).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   Claims 1, 3, 6-16, 39-42, 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ono (US 2002/0035685 A1) in view of Lofgren (US 2001/0037313

A1).

14.   Referring to the instant claims, Ono discloses a client-server system with

security function intermediary (see abstract). Ono teaches an intermediary device

ensuring high security and lightening load on a client in a client-server system is

disclosed. The intermediary device is provided between the server and the client. The

intermediary device has a management table for storing security information indicating

at least one of server authentication, client authentication, and encryption and

decryption, and session information regarding a session formed between the server and the client. The intermediary device performs appropriate security operation depending on a received message on behalf of the client (see abstract).

15.   Referring to the independent claim 1, the limitation "at least first and second processing device and an interface, the first processing device transmitting a communication having a desired destination being the second processing device" is met by the client, the intermediary device and the server (see Fig. 3). The limitation "the first processing device also transmitting security information associated with the communication..." is met by the client transmitting the CRL data to the intermediary device (see Fig. 3). The limitation "the interface processing the subset of security information and communication to determine when there is a match between the security information indicating an authorized condition" is met by teaching that the intermediary device has a management table for storing security information indicating at least one of server authentication, client authentication, and encryption and decryption, and session information regarding a session formed between the server and the client. The intermediary device performs appropriate security operation depending on a received message on behalf of the client (see abstract). The limitation "the interface transmitting the communication to the second processing device on identification of an authorized condition" is met by Fig. 9. Ono teaches comparing the security information against stored security information and transmitting communication if there is a match (see Figs.1 and 3).

16.   Ono, however, does not teach the stored security information comprising the

biometric information. Referring to the instant claims, Lofgren discloses a digital

watermarking system (see abstract and Fig. 1). Lofgren teaches that watermarking is

employed to facilitate secure online transactions. The system includes a user terminal

and a central site. The user terminal includes a watermark reader, and a capture device

to capture an image of a watermarked document. The central site includes a database

of image hashes. The user terminal communicates with the central site. The watermark

reader reads a watermark and computes a hash of a captured image, and passes the

hash to the central site for comparison with the database of image hashes (see

abstract). Lofgren also teaches that security information within the watermark can be

verification data (e.g. retinal scan, voice recognition, biometric verification data) - see

lines 0069.

17.   Therefore, at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Ono for processing the information

over network by using the security information comprising the biometric information

stored on the crad as taught in Lofgren. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to modify the system of Ono for processing the information over network by

using the security information comprising the biometric information stored on the crad

as taught in Lofgren for guarding against granting access to a person who has found or

stolen someone else's card (see Lofgren lines 0069).

18.   Referring to claims 6 and 7, Lofgren teaches storage device comprising the

card and the reader adapted to upload the security information from the card (see 43 in

Fig. 2).

19.   Referring to claim 8, Ono teaches that security information is transmitted over a

network.

20.   Referring to claim 9, Lofgren teaches network being the internet.

21.   Referring to claims 10 and 54-55, it is well known in the art to use the GPS

tracking device or IP address on the card. One of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to use GPS tracking device on the card for providing the location

information.

22.   Referring to claim 11, Lofgren teaches the use of a PIN code (see lines 0069).

23.   Referring to claims 12 and 13-14, Lofgren teaches the card having the photo or a

digital image.

24.   Referring to claim 15, Lofgren teaches communication being an email

communication over the internet.

25.   Referring to claim 16, Lofgren teaches biometric information being voice print or

retina scan (see lines 0069).

26.   Referring to claim 52, detection and filtering of viruses is well known in the art of

security information processing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grigory Gurshman whose telephone number is (571)272-3803. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571)272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Grigory Gurshman
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

GG

GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100